

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, and 17 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 11, and 17.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate whether the drawings filed with the application are acceptable.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over the article entitled "WAP Architecture (Version 12-July-2001)" (hereafter "WAP Architecture"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. The Applicant respectfully asserts that WAP Architecture does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in the claims. Specifically, with respect to independent claim 1, WAP Architecture fails to teach at least the following elements,

- (i) WAP Architecture fails to teach or suggest an "application content locating module" that is configured to locate content for a wireless client *based on the type of wireless client*. Rather, WAP Architecture only addresses a generic system architecture which is used to service client request. Thus, WAP Architecture focuses on providing a way for wireless clients to interact with the existing Internet infrastructure (*See*, WAP Architecture, pp. 11-13). However, in providing the generic system architecture, WAP Architecture fails to address the issue of servicing different wireless clients that require different content *based on their type*.

(ii) WAP Architecture fails to teach or suggest “an application content transformation service” that is configured to present the aforementioned content to the client in a format suitable for the client based on the wireless client’s type. As discussed in WAP Architecture, the Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) requires that wireless clients have micro-browsers that include functionality to interpret content expressed in Wireless Mark Language (WML) and content expressed in Extensible Hypertext Markup Language (XHTML) (*See* WAP Architecture, p.20, Section 7.5). Further, WAP, as discussed in WAP Architecture, all content forwarded to the wireless clients is expressed using WML and/or XHTML (*See* WAP Architecture, p.20, Section 7.5). In view of the above requirements, WAP as discussed in WAP Architecture, does not require any functionality to determine the type of wireless client and then use this information to determine how to transform the content into the appropriate format, because WAP only supports content sent using WML and/or XHTML. In view of the above, WAP Architecture clearly does not teach or suggest “an application content transformation service” as recited in independent claim 1.

In view of the above, WAP Architecture cannot be used to support a rejection of independent claim 1 or any claims depending therefrom. Further, WAP Architecture may not be used to support a rejection of independent claims 17 and 26 or any claims depending therefrom for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1. If the Examiner wishes to maintain the above rejection, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to specifically indicate in WAP Architecture, where Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) includes functionality to determine the specific type of wireless client (as it pertains to retrieving and formatting data) and functionality to use the aforementioned information to retrieve specific content.

With respect to independent claim 11, WAP Architecture may not be used to support a rejection of independent claim 11 or any claims depending therefrom. Specifically, the Applicant respectfully asserts that WAP Architecture does not teach or suggest “...a plurality of classes of wireless clients, each of said classes of wireless clients comprising unique identification parameters.” In particular, the Examiner has attempted to equate classes of clients (*i.e.*, types of clients) with the components of the protocol stack (*See* Office Action mailed November 1, 2004, p.4). As discussed in WAP Architecture (*See* WAP Architecture, p.14), the components of the protocol stack merely include various components that interpret protocols

(e.g., WSP, WTP, HTTP, etc.) which are used to communicate data across the wireless network. Clearly, components in a protocol stack are not equivalent to “a plurality of classes of wireless clients...” In view of the above, there is no teaching or suggestion in WAP Architecture of “a plurality of classes of wireless clients, each of said classes of wireless client comprising unique identification parameters (i.e., parameters which are used to identify the type of wireless client for the purposes of determining how to format the response to the wireless client’s request).

Further, the Applicant respectfully asserts that WAP Architecture does not teach or suggest “retrieving XML data....in response to a particular client type content access request...” Specifically, as described with respect to independent claim 1, in providing the generic system architecture, WAP Architecture fails to address the issue of servicing different wireless clients that require different content *based on their type*.

In addition to the above reasons, WAP Architecture fails to teach or suggest transforming content into a suitable format using client specific templates as recited in dependent claims 2, 12-14, 16, 19, and 27-28.

Finally, with respect to claim 25, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to more specifically indicate where the limitation “wherein said XML content integration and transformation provider further comprises availability logic for determining whether content selected by said client is available for presentation to the client” is taught in WAP Architecture.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/525001; P6093).

Dated: February 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA & MAY L.L.P.
1221 McKinney, Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant